AN

Explication and Vindication

OF THE

Athanaſian Creed.

IN A

Third LETTER,

Purſuant of Two former,

Concerning the

Sacred Trinity.

TOGETHER

With a POSTSCRIPT, in Anſwer to another LETTER.

By *JOHN WALLIS*, D. D.

LONDON:

Printed for *Tho. Parkhurſt*, at the *Bible* and *Three Crowns*, in *Cheapſide*, 1691.

Explication and Vindication

OF THE

Athanasian Creed.

IN

Third Letter

Author of Two former

Sacred Trinity.

AN

EXPLICATION and VINDICATION OF THE Athanaſian Creed.

SIR,

IN purſuance of what I have ſaid in a former Letter, concerning (what we commonly call) the *Athanaſian* Creed; it may not be amiſs to expreſs it a little more diſtinctly.

We call it commonly *the Athanaſian Creed*, not that we are certain it was penned (juſt in this form) by *Athanaſius* himſelf; (for, of this, I find that learned men are doubtful,) but it was penned either by himſelf, or by ſome other about that time, according to the mind and doctrine of *Athanaſius*. In like manner as what we call *the Apoſtles Creed*, we take to be penned (very anciently) according to what Doctrine the Apoſtles had taught them, though not perhaps in thoſe very words.

But whoever was the Compiler (whether *Athanaſius* himſelf, or ſome other) of the *Athanaſian* Creed, I ſuppoſe, the *Damnatory Sentences* (as they are called) therein, were not by him intended to be underſtood with that Rigor that ſome would now inſinuate, (who, becauſe perhaps they do not like the main Doctrines of that Creed, are willing to diſparage it, by repreſenting it to the greateſt diſadvantage they can,) as if it were intended, That whoever doth not explicitely and diſtinctly know, and underſtand, and aſſent to, all and every clauſe and ſyllable therein, could not be ſaved. (Which, I ſuppoſe, neither the Author did intend, nor any other ſober perſon would affirm.) But, that the Doctrine therein delivered (concerning God and Chriſt) is ſound and true Doctrine in it ſelf, and ought, *as to the ſubſtance of it*, to be believed as ſuch, by all perſons (of Age, and Capacity, and who have opportunity of being well informed in it,) who do expect ſalvation by Chriſt; at leaſt ſo far as not to disbelieve the ſubſtance of it, when underſtood. There being no other ordinary way to be ſaved, (that we know of) than that by the Knowledge and Faith of God in Chriſt.

But what measures God will take in cases extraordinary, (as of Infancy, Incapacity, Invincible Ignorance, or the like,) is not the thing there intended to be declared; nor is it necessary for us to know; but to leave it rather to the Wisdom and Counsel of God, *whose Judgments are unsearchable, and his Ways past finding out*, Rom. 11. 33.

Much less do I suppose, that he intended to extend the necessity of such explicite Knowledge, to the Ages before Christ. For many things may be requisite to be explicitely Known and Believed by us to whom the Gospel is revealed, which was not so to them, before *the Veil was taken away from Moses face*, and *Immortality brought to light through the Gospel*, 2 Cor. 3. 13, 14. 2 Tim. 1. 10.

Nor are we always to press words according to the utmost rigor that they are possibly capable of; but according to such equitable sence as we use to allow to other *Homiletical* Discourses, and which we have reason to believe to have been the true meaning of him whose words they are.

And I have the more reason to press for such equitable construction, because I observe those *hard Clauses* (as they are thought to be) annexed only

only to ſome Generals; and not to be extended (as I conceive) to every Particular, in the Explication of thoſe Generals.

It begins thus; "*Whoſoever will be ſaved; before* "*all things, it is neceſſary, that he hold the Catholick* "*Faith.* Where, *before all things*, is as much as *Imprimis*; importing, that it is *mainly neceſſary*, or a *principal requiſite*, to Believe aright; eſpecially, concerning *God*, and *Chriſt*.

Which, as to perſons of Years, and Diſcretion, and who have the opportunity of being duly Inſtructed, I think is generally allowed by all of us, to be neceſſary (as to the *Subſtantials* of Religion) in the ordinary way of ſalvation, without diſputing, what God may do in extraordinary Caſes, or how far God may be pleaſed, upon a general Repentance, as of Sins unknown, to pardon ſome culpable Misbelief.

It follows; "*Which Faith, except every one do* "*keep whole and undefiled*, (σῶον καὶ ἀμόλυντον) *without* "*doubt he ſhall periſh everlaſtingly.* That is, (as I conceive) Unleſs a perſon (ſo qualified and ſo capacitated, as I before expreſſed) do keep it *whole* or *ſound*, as to the *Subſtantials* of it (though poſſibly he may be ignorant of ſome Particulars of the true Faith;) and *undefiled*, or *intemerate*, (without adding thereunto, or putting ſuch a ſence

a ſence upon ſuch *Subſtantials*, as ſhall be deſtructive thereof,) ſhall (except he repent) periſh everlaſtingly. Which, I think, is no more than that of *Mar.* 16. 16. *He that Believeth not, ſhall be Damned.* And what Limitations or Mitigations are there to be allowed, are (by the ſame equity) to be allowed in the preſent Clauſe before us. Which therefore may (in this true ſence) be ſafely admitted.

And here I think fit to obſerve, That whereas there may be an ambiguity in the Engliſh word *whole*, which ſometime ſignifies *totus*, and ſometime *ſanus* or *ſalvus*, it is here certainly to be underſtood in the latter ſence, as anſwering to the Greek ὑγιὴς. It is not ὅλην *totam*, but σώαν *ſanam* or *ſalvam*. And τηρεῖν σώαν καὶ ἀμώμητον, to keep the Faith *ſalvam & intemeratam*, which is tranſlated *whole and undefiled*, might (to the ſame ſence) be rendered *ſafe and ſound*. Now a man may well be ſaid to be ſafe and ſound, notwithſtanding a Wart or a Wen, or even a Hurt or Maim, ſo long as the Vitals be not endangered. And ſo, of the Catholick Faith, or Chriſtian Doctrine, ſo long as there is nothing deſtructive of the main Subſtantials or Fundamentals of it, though poſſibly there may be an Ignorance or Miſtake, as to ſome particulars of leſſer moment.

After

After this Preface (between it and the Concluſion, or Epilogue) there ſollows indeed a large Expoſition of (what he declares to be) the Catholick Faith; (That is; to be ſome Part of it: For I take the whole *Scripture* to be *the Catholick Faith*; whereof this Collection is but a part.) beginning with, *The Catholick Faith is this*: And Ending with, *This is the Catholick Faith.*

But it is not ſaid, That except a man Know and Believe *every particular* of that *Explication*, he ſhall periſh eternally; but only, *Except he keep the Catholick Faith* (as to the Subſtantials of it) *ſafe and ſound.*

For doubtleſs there may be many Particulars of Catholick Faith (contained in the Word of God) which a man may be ignorant of, and yet be ſaved. It is *True*, That the Name of our Saviour's Mother was *Mary*; and the Name of the Judge who condemned him was *Pontius Pilate*: and both theſe are put into (what we call) the Apoſtles Creed; and are part of the Catholick Faith; and which (ſuppoſing that we know them to be declared in Scripture) we ought to Believe. But I ſee not why it ſhould be thought (of it ſelf) more neceſſary to ſalvation (if he do not know it to be declared in Scripture) for a man to know that her Name

was

was *Mary*, than that the Name of *Adam*'s Wife was *Eve*, or *Abraham*'s Wife *Sarah*, or that one of *Job*'s Daughters was called *Jemima*; (for all theſe are declared in Scripture; and, ſuppoſing that we know them ſo to be, ought to be believed as part of the Catholick Faith.) Nor do I know, that it is (of it ſelf) more neceſſary to know that the Name of the Judge who condemned our Saviour was *Pontius Pilate*, than that the Name of the High-Prieſt was *Caiaphas*. And though one of theſe, and not the other, be put into the Apoſtles Creed, whereby we are more likely to know that than the other: yet both of them being True, and declared in Scripture; they are, both of them, parts of the Catholick Faith, and to be believed: but neither of them (I think) with ſuch neceſſity, as that, who knows them not, cannot be ſaved.

And what I ſay of this General Preface in the beginning, is in like manner to be underſtood of the General Concluſion in the end; *which* (Catholick Faith) *except a man believe faithfully, he cannot be ſaved.* Of which I ſhall ſay more anon.

After the General Preface, (concerning the neceſſity of holding the Catholick Faith,) he proceeds to two main Branches of it, (that of

the Trinity, and that of the Incarnation, with the Conſequents thereof;) which he declares likewiſe, as what *ought to be believed.*

That of the Trinity, he declares thus in General; "*And the Catholick Faith is this*; (that is, this is one main part of the Catholick Faith;) namely, "*That we worſhip One God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity: Neither Confounding the Perſons, nor Dividing the Subſtance.* Which is what we commonly ſay, *There be Three Perſons, yet but One God.* And this General (which, after ſome particular Explications, he doth reſume) is what he declares *ought to be believed.* But he doth not lay ſuch ſtreſs upon each Particular of that Explication, though True.

He thus explains himſelf; "*For there is one* "*Perſon of the Father, another of the Son, and ano-* "*ther of the Holy Ghoſt.* (Which Perſons therefore are not to be confounded.) "*But the God-* "*head of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy* "*Ghoſt, is all One.* That is, one Subſtance, one God. (Which is what he ſaid of not Dividing the Subſtance, as if the Three Perſons ſhould be Three Subſtances, or Three Gods.) According as Chriſt ſays of Himſelf and the Father, *John* 10. 30. *I and the Father are One*: ἓν ἐσμεν,

(not

(not εἷς,) that is, one Thing, one Subſtance, one God, not one Perſon. And 1 *John* 5. 7. *Theſe Three are One*; (ἕν εἰσι) *Hi Tres ſunt Unum*, not *Unus*. Theſe three *Who's*, are one *What*. They are one Thing, one Subſtance, one God, though Three Perſons.

And as their Godhead, or Subſtance undivided, is all one; ſo it follows, "*The Glory equal, the Majeſty co-eternal.* Such as the "*Father is*, (as to the common Godhead) "*ſuch is the Son, and* "*ſuch is the Holy Ghoſt. The Father uncreate, the* "*Son uncreate, and the Holy Ghoſt uncreate. The* "*Father incomprehenſible, the Son incomprehenſible,* "*and the Holy Ghoſt incomprehenſible. The Father* "*eternal, the Son eternal, and the Holy Ghoſt eter-*"*nal.* For all theſe are Attributes of the common Deity, which is the ſame of All. "*And* "*yet they are not Three Eternals, but One Eternal.* Not Three Eternal Gods, (though Three Perſons) but One Eternal God. "*As alſo there are not three Incomprehenſibles, nor three Uncreated; but one Uncreated, and one Incomprehenſible.* One and the ſame Subſtance or Deity, uncreated and incomprehenſible. "*So likewiſe the Father is Al-*"*mighty, the Son Almighty, and the Holy Ghoſt Al-*"*mighty; and yet there are not Three Almighties, but* "*One Almighty. So the Father is God, the Son is*

 "*God,*

" *God, and the Holy Ghoſt is God; and yet there are* " *not Three Gods, but One God. So likewiſe the Fa-* " *ther is Lord,* (κύριος, the word by which the Greeks do expreſs the Hebrew Name *Jehovah*, the proper incommunicable Name of God,) " *the Son Lord, and the Holy Ghoſt Lord; and yet* " *not Three Lords, but One Lord.* (Not three *Jehovahs*, but one *Jehovah.*) " *For like as we are com-* " *pelled by the Chriſtian Verity to acknowledge every* " *Perſon by himſelf to be God and Lord, ſo are we* " *forbidden by the Catholick Religion, to ſay, There be* " *Three Gods, or Three Lords.* Which are ſo many particular Explications or Illuſtrations of what was before ſaid in general of *not Confounding the Perſons, nor Dividing the Subſtance.* Which Explications, though they be all true, (and neceſſary Conſequents of what was before ſaid in general;) yet to none of them is annexed ſuch Sanction, as that whoſoever doth not Believe or not Underſtand theſe Illuſtrations, cannot be ſaved. 'Tis enough to Salvation, if they hold the true Faith, as to the ſubſtance of it, though in ſome other form of words, or though they had never heard the *Athanaſian* Creed.

Nor is any ſuch Sanction annexed to the Perſonal Properties, which next follow; " *The Fa-* " *ther is made of none; neither Created, nor Begotten.*

" *The*

" *The Son is of the Father alone; not Made, nor Crea-*
" *ted, but Begotten. The Holy Ghoſt is of the Fa-*
" *ther, and of the Son; neither Made, nor Begotten,*
" *but Proceeding.*

Where, by the way, here is no Anathematization of the Greek Church, (of which thoſe who would, for other reaſons, diſparage this Creed, make ſo loud an out-cry.) 'Tis ſaid indeed *He doth proceed*, (and ſo ſay they,) but not that he doth *proceed from the Father and the Son.* And 'tis ſaid, He is *Of the Father and Of the Son* (ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ) ſome way or other; (and even this, I ſuppoſe, they would not deny;) but whether by *proceſſion from both*, or (if ſo) whether *in the ſame manner*, it is not ſaid; but warily avoided. (Though indeed it ſeems to favour what I think to be the truth, and what in the *Nicene* Creed is ſaid expreſly, that he doth *proceed from both*; and, for ought we know, *in the ſame manner*; which yet we do not determine.) Nor do I ſee any reaſon, why, on this account, we ſhould be ſaid to Anathematize the Greek Church, or they to Anathematize us, even though we ſhould not exactly agree, in what ſence he may be ſaid to be *Of the Father*, and in what *Of the Son.* And thoſe who are better acquainted with the Doctrine and the

Lan-

Languages, of the preſent Greek Churches, than moſt of us are, do aſſure us, that the differences between them and us are rather in ſome forms of expreſſions, than in the thing it ſelf. However, thoſe who would make ſo great a matter of this, ſhould rather quarrel at the *Nicene* Creed, than the *Athanaſian*: where it is expreſly ſaid of the Holy Ghoſt, that *he proceedeth from the Father and from the Son.* 'Tis not therefore for the phraſe *Filioque*, that they are ſo ready to quarrel at this Creed rather than the *Nicene*, but from ſome other reaſon, and, moſt likely, becauſe the Doctrine of the Trinity is here more fully expreſſed than in that, at which the *Socinian* is moſt offended.

I obſerve alſo, That theſe Perſonal Properties are expreſſed juſt by the Scripture words, *Beget*, *Begotten*, *Proceeding*, without affixing any ſence of our own upon them; but leaving them to be underſtood in ſuch ſence as in the Scripture they are to be underſtood. Agreeable to that modeſt Caution, which is proper in ſuch Myſteries.

It follows; "*So there is One Father, not three* "*Fathers*; *One Son, not three Sons*; *One Holy Ghoſt,* "*not three Holy Ghoſts. And in this Trinity, none is* "*afore or after other.* (That is, not in Time, though

though in Order.) "*None is greater or less than* "*another: But the whole three Persons are co-eternal* "*together, and co-equal.* Σῶαι οἱ τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις, καὶ συναΐδιαί εἰσιν ἑαυταῖς, καὶ ἴσαι. *The three* (οἱ τρεῖς) *are* (σῶαι ὑποστάσεις) *truly persons, or properly persons, and co-eternal each with other, and co-equal.*

Having thus finished these particular Explications, or Illustrations, concerning the Trinity, (without any *condemning Clause* of those who think otherwise, other than what is there included; namely, that if this be True, the contrary must be an Errour:) He then resumes the General, (as after a long Parenthesis,) "*So that in all things* "*(as is aforesaid) the Unity in Trinity, and the Tri-* "*nity in Unity, is to be Worshipped.* And to this General, annexeth this Ratification, "*He there-* "*fore that will be saved, must thus think of the Trini-* "*ty*: or, thus ought to think of the Trinity, or, *Let him thus think of the Trinity,* οὕτω περὶ τριάδος φρονείτω. And to this, I suppose, we do all agree, who believe the Doctrine of the Trinity to be true. For, if the thing be true, those who would be saved, ought to believe it.

He then proceeds to the Doctrine of the Incarnation. Which he declares in general as necessary to salvation. "*Furthermore, it is necessary* "*to everlasting salvation, that he also believe rightly*

"*the*

" *the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ.* Which is no more than that of *John* 3. 36. *He that believeth not the Son, shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.* And therefore we may safely say this also: *There being no other Name under Heaven whereby we must be saved, neither is there Salvation in any other,* Acts 4. 12.

After this (as before he had done of the Doctrine of the Trinity) he gives first a general Assertion of his being God and Man; and then a particular Illustration of his Incarnation. " *For the right Faith is, that we believe and confess,* " *That our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God* " *and Man.*

What follows, is a further Explication of this General. " *God, of the substance of the Father,* " *begotten before the Worlds. And Man, of the sub-* " *stance of his Mother, born in the World. Perfect* " *God, and perfect Man; of a reasonable Soul and* " *humane Flesh subsisting. Equal to the Father, as* " *touching his Godhead; and Inferiour to the Father,* " *as touching his Manhood. Who, although he be God* " *and Man, yet he is not Two, but One Christ. One,* " *not by conversion of the Godhead into Flesh, but by* " *taking of the Manhood into God. One altogether, not* " *by Confusion of Substance, but by Unity of Person. For* " *as the reasonable Soul and Flesh is one Man, so God* " *and Man is One Christ.* And

And thus far, as to the Deſcription of Chriſt's Perſon and Natures. The Particulars of which I take to be all true; and therefore ſuch as ought to be believed, when underſtood. But ſuch (many of them) as perſons of ordinary capacities, and not acquainted with School Terms, may not perhaps underſtand. Nor was it, I preſume, the meaning of the Pen-man of this Creed, that it ſhould be thought neceſſary to Salvation, that every one ſhould particularly underſtand all this: but, at moſt, that, when underſtood, it ſhould not be disbelieved. That in the general, being moſt material, That *Jeſus Chriſt, the Son of God, is God and Man*: the reſt being but Explicatory of this. Which Explications, though they be all true, are not attended with any ſuch clauſe, as if, without the explicite knowledge of all theſe, a man could not be ſaved.

He then proceeds to what Chriſt hath done for our Salvation, and what he is to do further at the laſt Judgment, with the Conſequents thereof. "*Who Suffered for our Salvation, Deſcended* "*into Hell, Roſe again the third day from the* "*Dead.*

That Clauſe of *deſcending into Hell*, or *Hades*, (κατῆλθεν εἰς ᾅδου,) which we meet with here,

and in the Apoſtles Creed, as it is now read, is not in the *Nicene* Creed; nor was it anciently (as learned Men ſeem to be agreed) in what we call the Apoſtles Creed. When or how it firſt came in, I cannot well tell: Nor will I undertake here to determine the ſence of it.

The Hebrew word *Sheol*, and the Greek *Hades*, which here we tranſlate *Hell*, (by which word we now-a-days uſe to denote *the Place of the Damned*,) was anciently uſed to ſignifie, ſometime the *Grave*, ſometime, the Place, State, or *Condition of the Dead*, whether good or bad. And when *Job* prays (*Job* 14. 13.) *O that thou wouldſt hide me in Sheol* (as in the Hebrew;) or *in Hades*, (as in the Greek Septuagint;) certainly he did not deſire to be in what we now call *Hell*; but rather (as we there tranſlate it) in the *Grave*, or the condition of thoſe that are *Dead*.

But what it ſhould ſignifie here, is not well agreed among learned Men. The Papiſts generally (becauſe that is ſubſervient to ſome of their beloved Tenents) would have it here to ſignifie the Place of the Damned; and would have it thought, that the Soul of Chriſt, during the time his Body lay in the Grave, was amongſt the Devils and Damned Souls in Hell. Others do, with more likelyhood, take it for the Grave,

or

or condition of the Dead: and take this of Christ's *descending into Hades*, to be the same with his *being Buried*, or *lying in the Grave*. The rather, because in the *Nicene* Creed, where is mention of his being *Buried*, there is no mention of his *descent into Hell*, or *Hades*: And here, in the *Athanasian* Creed, where mention is made of this, there is no mention of his being *Buried*; as if the same were meant by both phrases, which therefore need not be repeated. And though in the Apostles Creed there be now mention of both, yet anciently it was not so; that of his *descent into Hell*, being not to be found in ancient Copies of the Apostles Creed. If it signifie any thing more than his *being Buried*, it seems most likely to import his *Continuance in the Grave*, or *the State and Condition of the Dead*, for some time. And the words which follow, ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν, say nothing of his *coming out of Hell*, but only of his *rising from the Dead*.

But the words here stand undetermined to any particular sence; and so they do in the Apostles Creed; and are so also in the Articles of our Church. Where it is only said, (because in the Creed it stands so,) That we are to believe, *That he descended into Hell*, without affixing any particular sence to it.

The words, doubtleſs, have reſpect to that of *Acts* 2. 27. where, *Thou wilt not leave my Soul in Hell*, (or *Hades*) *nor ſuffer thine Holy One to ſee Corruption*, is applied to Chriſt, (cited out of *Pſal.* 16. 10. where the ſame had before been ſpoken of *David.*) And his *not being left in Hades*, ſeems to ſuppoſe his *having been* (for ſome time) *in Hades*, whatever by *Hades* is there meant. And *Verſe* 31. *his being not ſo left*, is expreſly expounded of *his Reſurrection.* And ſo again in *Acts* 13. 35. Now, as we have no reaſon to think, that *David's being in Hell*, or *Sheol*, (though not to be left there) can ſignifie, his being in Hell *among the Devils and damned Spirits*, but rather in the *Grave*, or the *Condition of the Dead*; ſo neither that Chriſt's being in *Hell*, or *Hades*, (which is the Greek word anſwering to the Hebrew *Sheol*) ſhould ſignifie any other than *His* being in the *Grave*, or condition of the *Dead*; from whence, by his *Reſurrection*, he was delivered. And to this purpoſe ſeems that whole Diſcourſe of *Peter*, *Acts* 2. 24,---32. and of *Paul*, *Acts* 13. 30,---37.

But, without determining it to any particular ſence, the Creed leaves the word *Hell* indefinitely here to be underſtood, in the ſame ſence what ever it be, in which it is to be underſtood,

Acts

Acts 2. 27, 31. and *Pſal.* 16. 10. And ſo far we are ſafe.

It follows; "*He aſcended into Heaven; He ſit-*
"*teth on the right hand of the Father, God Almighty.*
"*From whence he ſhall come to judge the quick and the*
"*dead. At whoſe coming all men ſhall riſe again with*
"*their Bodies; and ſhall give account for their own*
"*Works. And they that have done Good, ſhall go into*
"*Life everlaſting: and they that have done Evil, into*
"*everlaſting Fire.* (Of all which, there is no doubt but that it ought to be believed.) Ending with, "*This is the Catholick Faith.* That is, this is true and ſound Doctrine, and ſuch as every true Chriſtian ought to believe.

And, as he had begun all with a general Preface, ſo now he cloſeth all with a general Concluſion: "*Which* (Catholick Faith) *except a man*
"*believe faithfully, he cannot be ſaved.* That is, the Doctrine here delivered is true, (and ſo I think it is in all the parts of it,) and is (part of) the Catholick Faith: (The whole of which Faith, is the whole Word of God.) That is, part of that Faith, which all true Chriſtians do, and ought to Believe. Which Catholick Faith, (the whole of which is the whole Word of God) except a man (ſo qualified as I before expreſſed) do believe faithfully, (that is, except he truly believe it)

it) as to the *Subſtantials* of it, (though poſſibly he may be ignorant of many particulars therein) he cannot (without ſuch Repentance as God ſhall accept of) be ſaved. Which, ſo limitted, (as it ought to be) I take to be ſound Doctrine, and agreeable to that of *John* 3. 16. *He that believeth not, is condemned already; becauſe he hath not believed on the Name of the only begotten Son of God:* And *Ver.* 36. *He that believeth not the Son, ſhall not ſee life; but the wrath of God abideth on him:* That is, (according to the words of this Creed) he that believeth not aright (of God and Chriſt) *cannot be ſaved.*

Which words of Chriſt, we may ſafely interpret both with an aſpect on the Doctrine of the *Trinity* (becauſe of thoſe words, *the only Begotten Son of God*;) and to that of the *Incarnation of Chriſt*, and the Conſequents thereof; (becauſe of thoſe words in the beginning of the Diſcourſe, *Ver.* 16, 17, *God ſo loved the World, that he Gave his only Begotten Son*, &c. and *God ſent his Son into the world--- that the world through him might be ſaved:*) Which are the two main Points inſiſted on in the *Athanaſian* Creed. And he who doth not *Believe* on the Name of this *only Begotton Son of God*, and *thus ſent into the world*, (the Text tells us) *ſhall not ſee life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.*

him. Which fully agrees with what is here ſaid, *Except a man believe the Catholick Faith,* (of which the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, and of the *Incarnation*, are there intimated, and are here expreſſed, to be conſiderable Branches) *he cannot be ſaved.* And what Limitations or Mitigations are to be underſtood in the one place, are reaſonably to be allowed as underſtood in the other. And, conſequently, thoſe Damnatory Clauſes (as they are called) in the *Athanaſian* Creed (rightly underſtood) are not ſo formidable (as ſome would pretend) as if, becauſe of them, the whole Creed ought to be laid aſide.

For, in brief, it is but thus; The Preface and the Epilogue tell us, That *whoſo would be ſaved, it is neceſſary, or* (χρὴ) *he ought to hold the Catholick Faith. Which Faith, except he keep whole and undefiled,* or (σῶον καὶ ἀμόλυντον) *ſafe and inviolate, he ſhall periſh everlaſtingly*; or, *which except he believe faithfully, he cannot be ſaved.* Which is no more ſevere, than that of our Saviour, *Mark* 16. 16. *He that believeth not, ſhall be damned.*

He then inſerts a large Declaration of the Catholick Faith, eſpecially as to two main Points of it; that of the Trinity, and that of the Incarnation. And if all he there declares be true, (as I think it is,) we have then no reaſon to quarrel

quarrel with it upon that account. But he doth not ſay, That a man cannot be ſaved, who doth not Know or Underſtand every particular thereof.

Of the Firſt, he ſays but this, *He that would be ſaved, ought thus to think*, or (οὕτω φρονεῖτω) *let him thus think of the Trinity*; namely, That *the Unity in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity, ought to be Worſhipped.*

Of the Second, what he ſays is this, *Furthermore it is neceſſary to Eternal Salvation, That he believe aright the Incarnation of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*: Which is no more ſevere than that of our Saviour, *He that believeth not the Son, ſhall not ſee life, but the wrath of God abideth on him; becauſe he hath not believed on the Name of the only begotten Son of God, whom God hath ſent into the world, that the world through him might be ſaved*, John 3. 17, 18, 36.

Beſide theſe, there are no Damnatory Clauſes in the whole. All the reſt are but Declaratory. And, if what he declares be true, we have no reaſon to find fault with ſuch Declaration.

Now as to thoſe two Points; that of the Trinity, and that of the Incarnation, (which are the only Points in queſtion,) there is a double Inquiry, (as I have elſewhere ſhewed,) Whether the things be Poſſible; and whether they

they be True. The Possibility may be argued from Principles of Reason: The Truth of them from Revelation only. And it is not much questioned, but that the Revelation, in both Points, is clear enough, if the things be not impossible.

As to that of the Trinity; I have already shewed, (in a former Letter) That there is therein no Impossibility, but that what in one consideration are *Three*, (which we commonly call three Persons,) may yet (in another consideration) be *One* God.

I shall now proceed to shew, That neither is there any Impossibility, as to the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Now this consists of two Branches; That of his being born of a *Virgin*, and that of the *Hypostatical Union* (as it is commonly called) of the Humane Nature with the Second Person of the Sacred Trinity.

As to the former of the two, there can be no pretence of Impossibility. For the same God who did at first make *Adam* of the Dust of the Earth, without either Father or Mother, and who made *Eve* of *Adam*'s Rib, (without a Mother at least, however *Adam* may be fansied as a Father,) and who shall at the last day recall

the Dead out of the Duſt, may doubtleſs, if he ſo pleaſe, cauſe a Woman, without the help of Man, to conceive a child. There is certainly no Impoſſibility in nature, why it may not, by an Omnipotent Agent, be brought to paſs. And when the Scripture declares it ſo to be, there is no reaſon (if we believe the Scripture) to diſbelieve the Thing.

It is no more than when Chriſt cured *the blind man's eyes with clay and ſpittle*: Or when he ſaid, *Lazarus, come forth*, and he did ſo. Or when *God ſaid, Let there be Light, and there was Light*: And, of the whole Creation, *He ſpake, and it was done, he commanded, and it ſtood faſt.* No more than when he made *Aaron's Rod* (a dry Stick) *to bud and bloſſom, and yield Almonds*: Or what is implied in that, *Let not the Eunuch ſay, I am a dry tree.* And not much more than when God gave *Abraham a Son in his old age*; and, notwithſtanding *the deadneſs of Sarah's womb.*

Joh. 9. 6.
Joh. 11. 43, 44.
Gen. 1. 3.
Pſal. 33. 9.
Numb. 17. 8.
Iſai. 56. 3.
Gen. 18. 11, 12.
Rom. 4. 19.

I was about to ſay, (and it is not much amiſs if I do) itis not much more than what (pretty often) happens amongſt men, when God gives both Sexes to the ſame perſon, (ſuch there

are,

are, and have been; and I think there is one yet living, who was first as a Woman married to a Man, and is since as a Man married to a Woman;) and what hinders them, but that God, if he please, may *mingle* the *Effects* of both these Sexes in the same Body? A little alteration in the structure of the Vessels would do it. For when there is in the same body, and so near, *Semen virile & muliebre*, what hinders but there might be a passage for them to mix? And Plants, we know, do propagate without a fellow, though it be otherwise in Animals. And whereas this is said to be by *the Holy Ghost coming upon her, and the Power of the Highest overshadowing* the Blessed Virgin; it is not much unlike that of *the Spirit of God's* Incubation, or *moving upon the face of the Waters*. So that, as to this Point, here is nothing Impossible, nothing Incredible. Luke 1. 35. Gen. 1. 2.

The other Particular, as to the *Hypostatical Union*; How God and Man can be united in one Person, may seem more difficult for us to apprehend, because we understand so little of the Divine Essence, and consequently are less able to determine, what is, and what is not, consistent with it. And, when all is done, if we

be never ſo certain, that there is ſuch an Union, yet it will be hard to ſay How it is.

But we have no reaſon from thence to conclude the thing Impoſſible becauſe (we know not How it is done. Becauſe there be many other things in nature, which we are ſure to be, of which we are almoſt at as great a loſs as to the manner How they be, as in the preſent caſe.

Solomon, as wiſe as he was, and how well ſoever skilled in Natural Philoſophy, doth yet acknowledge himſelf, in many things to be at a loſs, when he would ſearch out the bottom of Natural things, and even when he made it his Buſineſs ſo to do. *When* (ſays he) *I applied my heart to know wiſdom, and to ſee the buſineſs that is done upon the earth: Then I beheld all the work of God; that a man cannot find out the work of God that is done under the ſun: Becauſe though a man labour to ſeek it out, yet he ſhall not find it. Yea further, though a wiſe man ſeek to know it, yet ſhall he not be able to find it*, Eccleſ. 8. 16, 17. And ſhall we then ſay, of *the deep things of God*, The thing is impoſſible, becauſe we cannot find it out? And if we conſider how many puzzling Queſtions God puts to *Job*, in the 37, 38, 39, 40, 41 Chapters of *Job*, even in natural

1 Cor. 2. 10,

tural things, we may very well (as *Job* did) *abhor our ſelves in duſt and aſhes*, and be aſhamed of our ignorant curioſity; and confeſs (as he doth) *I have uttered what I underſtood not; things too wonful for me which I know not*: when he found he had *talked like a fool, while he thought to be wiſe*, and would meaſure the Power and Wiſdom of God by the narrow limits of our underſtanding: And might come to *Job's* Reſolution (when he had well weighed the matter) *I know that thou canſt do every thing, and that no thought can be withholden from thee*, Job 42. 2, 3, 6. Rom. 1. 22.

The wind bloweth where it liſteth, (not where you pleaſe to appoint it,) *thou heareſt the ſound thereof, but canſt not tell whence it cometh, or whither it goeth*, (ſaith Chriſt to *Nicodemus*:) But ſhall we therefore conclude, The Wind doth not blow, becauſe we know not how or whence it bloweth? Or, that God cannot *command the Winds*, becauſe we cannot? We ſhould rather conclude, The *Wind doth* certainly *Blow*, (becauſe *we hear the ſound of it*,) though we know neither How, nor *Whence*: And, though they do not obey us, yet *the Wind and the Seas obey him*. Now (as he there further argues) *If, when he tells us of* Joh. 3. 8, 12. Mat. 8. 26, 27.

earthly

earthly things, we do not apprehend it, how much more if he tell us of Heavenly things? of the deep things of God?

But (to come a little nearer to the buſineſs) conſider we a little the Union of our own Soul and Body. 'Tis hardly accountable, nor perhaps conceivable by us, (who are moſtly converſant with material things,) How a Spiritual Immaterial Being (ſuch as our Souls are) and capable of a ſeparate exiſtence of its own, ſhould inform, actuate, and manage a material ſubſtance, ſuch as is that of our Body, and be ſo firmly United as to be One Perſon with it. By what handle can a Spirit Intangible take hold of a Tangible Material Body, and give Motion to it? Eſpecially if we ſhould admit *Lucretius*'s Notion;

Tangere vel Tangi, niſi Corpus, nulla poteſt res:

(which he repeats almoſt as often as *Homer* doth his τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενον) who doth thence repute it impoſſible for an Immaterial Being to move a Body. But we who believe the Soul to be a a Spirit, know it to be poſſible. Much more is it poſſible for God (though a Being infinitely more pure) who *giveth to all, Life and Breath*

Ac. 17, 25, 27, 28.

Breath and All things; and in whom *we Live and Move and have our Being*; and who *is not far from every one of us*. It would be hard for us to give an intelligible account, either how God moves all things, or how our Soul moves the Body; yet we are ſure it is ſo. That a Body may move a Body, ſeems not ſo ſtrange to apprehend, (for we ſee one Engine move another;) But, by what Mechaniſm, ſhall a Spirit give Motion to a Body when at reſt? or, Stop it when in Motion? or, Direct its Motions this way or that way? It would be thought ſtrange, that a *Thought* of ours ſhould Move a ſtone: And it is as hard to conceive (did we not ſee it daily) How a *Thought* ſhould put our Body in Motion, and another *Thought* ſtop it again. Yet this we ſee done every day, though we know not How. And it is almoſt the ſame thing in other Animals. And more yet, when an Angel aſſumes a Body. There are none of theſe things we know, How; and yet we know, they are done.

I ſhall preſs this a little farther. Our Soul (we all believe) doth (after Death) continue to exiſt, in a ſeparate condition from the Body. And, I think, we have reaſon to believe alſo, that it will continue to Act as an Intellectual Agent, (not to remain in a ſtupid ſenſleſs ψυχοπαννυχία)

Elſe

Elſe I ſee not why *Paul* ſhould *deſire to depart, or to be diſſolved, and to be with Chriſt, which is far better*; rather than *to abide in Fleſh.* For while he abides in the Fleſh, he hath ſome enjoyment of Chriſt, (as well as an opportunity of doing ſome Service) which is more deſirable, if when he is departed, he have none at all. And, how can he then ſay, *That to Dye is gain?* Whether the Soul thus ſeparated ſhall be ſaid to have a *Subſiſtence* as well as an Exiſtence; Or, whether it may be properly ſaid then, to be an intire *Perſon*; (as the *Soul* and *Body* are, before *Death*, and after the *Reſurrection*) I will not Diſpute, becauſe, that were to contend about Words, and ſuch Words ſo ſignify, as we pleaſe to define them, and bear ſuch a Sence, as we pleaſe to put upon them. But it is (as the Angels are) an Intellectual, Spiritual Agent; and we uſe to ſay, *Actiones ſunt Suppoſitorum*; and *Suppoſitum Rationale*, is either a Perſon, or ſo near a Perſon, that it would be ſo if men pleaſe to call it ſo. And the Spiritual Being, which doth now ſeparately Exiſt, ſhall at the Reſurrection, reſume a Body into the ſame Perſonality with it ſelf, and ſhall with it become one Perſon, as before Death it had been.

Phil. 1. 21, 23, 24.

Now

Now if a Spiritual Immaterial Intellectual Being, ſeparately exiſtent by it ſelf, and ſeparately acting as an Intellectual Agent, may, at the Reſurrection, aſſume or reaſſume a Material Corporeal Being (Heterogeneous to it ſelf) into the ſame Perſonality with it ſelf, or ſo as to become one Perſon with it, while yet it ſelf remains Spiritual as before: What ſhould hinder (for it is but one ſtep further) but that a Divine Perſon, may aſſume Humanity, into the ſame perſonality with it ſelf, without ceaſing to be a Divine Perſon as before it was? If it be ſaid, That Perſon and Perſonality in the Sacred Trinity, are not juſt the ſame as what we ſo call in other caſes: It is granted; and by theſe words (which are but Metaphorical) we mean no more, but ſomewhat analogous thereunto; and which, (becauſe of ſuch analogy) we ſo call, as knowing no better words to uſe inſtead thereof: According as we uſe the words, *Father*, *Son*, *generate*, *beget*, and the like, in a metaphorical ſence, when applied to God. For no words, borrowed from Created Beings, can ſignifie juſt the ſame when applied to God, as when they were applied to Men, but ſomewhat analogous thereunto. And if the Soul (though we know not How) may and do (at the Reſurrection)

aſſume a Body ſo as to become the ſame Perſon with it ſelf (though neither the Body be thereby made a Soul, nor the Soul a Body; but remain as before, that a Body, and this a Soul, though now united into one Perſon:) Why may not a Divine Perſon aſſume Humanity, ſo to be what is analogous to what we call a Perſon; the Humanity remaining Humanity, and the Divinity remaining Divinity, though both united in One Chriſt; though we do not particularly know How?

We ſhould be at a great loſs, if (to anſwer an Atheiſt, or one who doth not believe the Scriptures) we were put to it, to tell him, How God made the World? Of what Matter? With what Tools or Engines? or, How a Pure Spirit could produce Matter where none was? He would tell us perhaps, *Ex nihilo nihil, in nihilum nil poſſe reverti*; Where nothing is, nothing can be made: and what once is, (though it may be changed) can never become Nothing: And will never believe the World was made, (but rather was from all Eternity) except we can tell him, How it was made. Now, if in this caſe, we may ſatisfie our ſelves (though perhaps it will not ſatisfie him) by ſaying, God made it, but we know not How: The ſame

muſt

muſt ſatisfie us here; That Chriſt was Incarnate, (God and Man) we are certain, (for ſo the Scripture doth aſſure us, as well as, That God made the World;) But, How God made the World; or, How the Son of God aſſumed Humanity, we cannot tell. Nor indeed is it fit for us to enquire, farther than God is pleaſed to make known to us. All further than this, are but the ſubtile Cob-webs of our Brain: Fine, but not Strong. Witty Conjectures, *How it may be*; rather than a clear Reſolution, *How it is*.

Another Objection I have met with: to which the Objecters muſt be contented with the ſame Anſwer; We know *it Is*, but we know not *How*. It would be endleſs for us, and too great a Curioſity, to think our ſelves able fully to explicate all the Hidden things of God. The Objection is this: Since the Three Perſons cannot be Divided; How is it poſſible, that One of them can Aſſume Humanity, and not the other? And why the Second Perſon, and not the Firſt or Third?

As to the Queſtion, Why? I ſay, It is ſo, becauſe ſo it pleaſed God; And *he giveth not account of his Matters*; He is not accountable to us, why he ſo willeth. Job 33. 13.

As to the Queſtion, How is it Poſſible? I ſee

no difficulty in that at all. The Perſons are Diſtinguiſhed, though not Divided. As in the Divine Attributes, God's Juſtice and Mercy are Diſtinguiſhable; though in God they cannot be Divided. And accordingly, ſome things are ſaid to be Effects of his Juſtice, others of his Mercy. So the Power and Will of God (both which are Individual from himſelf:) But when we ſay God is *Omnipotent*, we do not ſay he is *Omnivolent*. He wills indeed All things that Are, (elſe they could not be) but he doth not will all things Poſſible. And the like of other Attributes.

If therefore we do but allow as great a Diſtinction between the Perſons, as between the Attributes, (and certainly it is not leſs, but ſomewhat more,) there is no incongruity in aſcribing the Incarnation to One of the Perſons, and not to the reſt.

'Tis asked further, How I can accommodate this to my former Similitude, of a Cube and its Three Dimenſions; repreſenting a Poſſibility of Three Perſons, in one Deity. I ſay, Very eaſily. For it is very poſſible, for one Face of a Cube, ſuppoſe the Baſe, (by which I there repreſented the Second Perſon, as Generated of the Father,) to admit a Foil, or Dark Colour, while

while the Reſt of the Cube is Tranſparent; without deſtroying the Figure of the Cube, or the Diſtinction of its Three Dimenſions, which Colour is adventitious to the Cube. For the Cube was perfect without it, and is not deſtroyed by it. Which may ſome way repreſent Chriſt's *Humiliation*. Who being *Equal with God*, was *made Like unto Us*, and *took upon him the Form of a Servant*, Phil. 2. 6, 7.

So that, upon the whole Matter, there is no Impoſſibility in the Doctrine of the Incarnation, any more than in that of the Trinity. And, ſuppoſing them to be not Impoſſible; it is not denied but that they are, both of them, ſufficiently Revealed; and therefore to be Believed, if we believe the Scripture. And of the other Articles in the *Athanaſian* Creed, there is as little reaſon to doubt.

There is therefore no juſt Exception, as to the *Declarative* part of the *Athanaſian* Creed. And, as to the *Damnatory* part; we have before ſhewed, that it is no more ſevere, than other paſſages in Scripture to the ſame purpoſe; and to be underſtood with the like Mitigations as thoſe are. And, conſequently, that whole Creed, as hitherto, may juſtly be received.

'Tis

'Tis true, there be ſome Expreſſions in it, which, if I were now to Pen a Creed, I ſhould perhaps chuſe to leave out: But, being in, they are to be underſtood according to ſuch ſence as we may reaſonably ſuppoſe to be intended, and according to the Language of thoſe times When they did uſe to Anathematize great Errors, which they apprehended to be Deſtructive of the Chriſtian Faith, as things of themſelves Damnable, if not Repented of. And, I ſuppoſe, no more is here intended; nor of any other Errors, than ſuch as are Deſtructive of Fundamentals.

Yours,

Oxford, Octob. 28.
1690.

John Wallis.

Poſtſcript.

POSTSCRIPT.

November 15. 1690.

WHen this Third Letter was Printed, and ready to come abroad, I ſtopped it a little for this Poſtſcript; occaſioned by a ſmall Treatiſe which came to my hands, with this Title, *Dr. Wallis's Letter, touching the Doctrine of the Bleſſed Trinity, anſwered by his Friend.* It ſeems, I have more *Friends* abroad than I am aware of. But, *Who* this Friend is, or whether he be a *Friend*, I do not know. It is to let me underſtand, that a *Neighbour* of his, *reputed a Socinian*, is not *convinced* by it: But names ſome *Socinian* Authors, who endeavour to elude Scriptures alledged for the Trinity, by putting ſome other ſence upon them. He might have named as many, if he pleaſed, who have (to better purpoſe) written againſt thoſe Authors, in vindication of the True ſence. And if he ſhould Repeat what Thoſe have ſaid on the one ſide; and I, ſay over again, what Thoſe have ſaid on the

the other ſide; we ſhould make a long work of it.

But he knows very well, That was not the buſineſs of my Letter, to diſcourſe the whole Controverſie at large, (either as to the Evidence, or as to the Antiquity, of the Doctrine.) For this I had ſet aſide at firſt, (as done by others, to whom I did refer:) and confined my Diſcourſe to this ſingle Point, That there is *no Impoſſibility* (which is the *Socinians* great Objection) but that What in one conſideration is Three, may in another conſideration be One. And if I have ſufficiently evinced this, (as I think I have; and I do not find that he denies it;) I have then done what I there undertook. And, in ſo doing, have removed the great Objection, which the *Socinians* would caſt in our way: and, becauſe of which, they think themſelves obliged to ſhuffle off other Arguments on this pretence. Now (whether he pleaſe to call this *a Metaphyſick*, or *Mathematick Lecture*,) certain it is, that there are *Three diſtinct Dimenſions* (Length, Breadth, and Thickneſs) in *One Cube*. And, if it be ſo in Corporeals, there is no pretence of reaſon, why in Spirituals it ſhould be thought Impoſſible, that there be *three Somewhat's* which are but One God. And

theſe

theſe *Somewhat's*, till he can furniſh us with a better name, we are content to call *Perſons*, (which is the Scripture word, *Heb.* 1.3.) Which word we own to be but *Metaphorical*, (not ſignifying juſt the ſame here, as when applied to men,) as alſo are the words, *Father*, *Son*, *Generate*, *Begot*, &c. when applied to God. And more than this need not be ſaid, to juſtifie what there I undertook to defend.

Now 'tis eaſie for him (if he ſo pleaſe) to *burleſque* this, or turn it to *ridicule*, (as it is, any the moſt Sacred things of God;) but not ſo ſafe, *Ludere cum Sacris*. The Sacred Trinity (be it as it will) ſhould by us be uſed with more Reverence, than to make Sport of it.

I might here end, without ſaying more. But becauſe he is pleaſed to make ſome Excurſions, beſide the Buſineſs which I undertook to prove, (and which he doth not deny;) I will follow him in ſome of them.

He finds fault with the Similitude I brought, (though very proper to prove what it was brought for,) as too high a Speculation for *the poor Labourers in the Country, and the Tankard-bearers in* London. And therefore (having a mind to be pleaſant) he adviſeth rather (as a more *familiar Parallel*) to put it thus, *I* Mary, *take thee*

Peter James *and* John *for my wedded Husband*, &c. (thinking this, I ſuppoſe, to be Witty.) And truly (ſuppoſing *Peter*, *James*, and *John*, to be the ſame Man,) it is not much amiſs. But I could tell him, with a little alteration, (if their Majeſties will give me leave to make as bold with their Names, as he doth with the Names of Chriſt's Mother, and of his three Diſciples which were with him in the Mount at his Transfiguration, *Matth.* 17. 1.) it were not abſurd to ſay, *I* Mary, *take thee* Henry William Naſſaw; without making him to be three Men, or three Husbands; and without putting her upon any difficulty (as is ſuggeſted) How to diſpoſe of her Conjugal Affection. And, when the Lords and Commons declared Him to be King of *England*, *France*, and *Ireland*; they did not intend, by alotting him three diſtinct Kingdoms, to make him three Men. And when, for our Chancellor, we made choice of *James*, Duke, Marqueſs and Earl of *Ormond*; though he had three diſtinct Dignities, he was not therefore three Men, nor three Chancellors. And when *Tully* ſays *, *Suſtineo unus tres perſonas*; *meam*, *adverſarii*, *judicis*; which is in Engliſh, (that the *Tankard-bearer* may underſtand it,) *I being one and the ſame Man, do ſuſtain*

* 2 de Orat.

Three

Three Perſons; *that of Myſelf*, *that of my Adverſary*, *and that of the Judge*: He did not become three *Men*, by ſuſtaining three *Perſons*. And (in this Anſwer to my Letter) the *Friend* and his *Neighbour*, may (for ought I know) be the ſame *Man*, though he ſuſtain Two *Perſons*. And, I hope, ſome of theſe *Reſemblances*, may be ſo *plain*, and ſo *familiar*, as that *Ide and his Tankard-bearer* may *apprehend* them: and thence perceive, It is not Impoſſible that Three may be One. For if (among us) *one Man* may ſuſtain *three Perſons*, (without being *three Men*,) Why ſhould it be thought incredible, that *three Divine Perſons* may be *one God*? (as well as thoſe three other Perſons be one Man!) Nor need he the leſs believe it for having (as this Anſwerer ſuggeſts) been *taught it in his Catechiſm*, or (as *Timothy* did the Scriptures) *know it from a Child*. But I would not have him then to tell me, the Father is a *Duke*, the Son a *Marqueſs*, the Holy Ghoſt an *Earl*, (according as he is pleaſed to prevaricate upon the Length, Breadth and Thickneſs of a Cube;) but this rather, That God the Creator, God the Redeemer, and God the Sanctifier, are *the ſame God*. That God the Creator is *Omnipotent* and *Allſufficient*; that God the Redeemer is ſo too; and God the Sanctifier likewiſe.

wise. That God the Creator is to be *Loved with all our Heart*; and so God the Redeemer, and God the Sanctifier. And then there will be no Absurdity in all this.

As to what he says, that *All people that have reason enough to understand Numbers, know the difference between One, and More than one*; I might reply, That all people who can tell Money, know that *Three Groats* are but *One Shilling*, and *Three Nobles* are *One Pound*; and what in one consideration is *Three*, may in another consideration be but *One*. Which, if it look like a slight Answer, is yet sufficient to such an Argument.

He tells me somewhat of Dr. *Sherlock*, (wherein I am not concerned,) and somewhat of *the Brief History of the Unitarians*, (of which his Neighbour *gives* the Friend *a Copy*;) But he doth not tell me, as he might, (and therefore I tell him) that Dr. *Sherlock* hath confuted that *History*. But Dr. *Sherlock* says nothing contrary to what I defend. For if there be such Distinction (between the three Persons) as he assigns, then at least, there is a Distinction (which is what I affirm, without saying how great it is;). Nor doth he any where deny them to be *one God*.

He

He tells me a ſtory of ſomebody, who, in a publick Diſputation at *Oxford*, maintaining a *Theſis* againſt the *Socinians*, was *baffled* by his Opponent. Whom, or when, he means, I do not know; and ſo ſay nothing to it: But, that I may not be in his debt for a ſtory, I ſhall tell him another, which will be at leaſt as much to the purpoſe as his. It is, of their great friend, *Chriſtophorus Chriſtophori Sandius*, a diligent promoter of the *Socinian* Cauſe. He printed a Latin *Theſis* or Diſcourſe againſt the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt, which he calls *Problema Paradoxum de Spiritu Sancto*, with a general Challenge to this purpoſe, *Ut ſiquis in toto Orbe eruditorum forte ſit, qui doctrinâ magis polleat, quam quibuſcum hactenus ſit collocutus, ea legat quæ à ſe publice ſint edita argumenta, ſeque errare moneat, ac rectius ſentire doceat.* Hereupon, *Wittichius* accepts the Challenge, and writes againſt *Sandius*. To which *Sandius* anſwers, (taking in another as a partner with him in the Diſputation.) And *Wittichius* replies. And that with ſo good ſucceſs, that *Sandius* and his partner, acknowledged themſelves to be convinced by it, and to change their Opinion. This happening but a little before *Sandius* his death; His Partner (ſurviving) publiſhed to the World an Account hereof, (and

of

of *Sandius* declaring, before his death, that he was ſo convinced,) in a Letter of Thanks to *Wittichius* for it. What *Sandius* would have done further, if he had lived a little longer, we cannot tell. That of *Wittichius* bears this Title, *Cauſa Spiritûs Sancti, Perſonæ Divinæ, ejuſdem cum Patre & Filio eſſentiæ, (contra C. C. S. Problema Paradoxum,) aſſerta & defenſa, à Chriſtophoro Wittichio. Lugduni Batavorum apud Arnoldum Doude, 1678.* The Letter of Thanks bears this Title, *Epiſtola ad D. Chriſtophorum Gittichium Profeſſorem Lugdunenſem; Qua gratiæ ei habentur pro eruditiſſimis ipſius in Problema de Spiritu Sancto Animadverſionibus: Scripta à Socio Authoris Problematis Paradoxi: Per quas errores ſuos rejicere coactus eſt. Coloniæ, apud Joannem Nicolai.*

He takes it unkindly, that I charge it upon ſome of the *Socinians* that though they do not think fit directly to reject the Scriptures, yet think themſelves obliged to put ſuch a *forced ſence* upon them, as to make them ſignifie ſomewhat elſe. And tells me of ſome *Socinians*, who have ſo great a reſpect for the Scriptures, as to ſay that *the Scripture contains nothing that is repugnant to manifeſt Reaſon*; and *that what doth not agree with Reaſon, hath no place in Divinity*, &c. But this is ſtill in order to this Inference; That there-

therefore what they think not agreeable to Reaſon, muſt not be thought to be the ſence of Scripture: and therefore that they muſt put ſuch a *Force* upon the Words, how great ſoever, as to make them comply with their ſence. If he except againſt the words, *how great a Force ſoever*, as too hard an Expreſſion of mine: They are *Socinus*'s own words, (in his Epiſtle to *Balcerovius*, of *January* 30. 1581.) *Certe contraria ſententia adeo mihi & abſurda & pernicioſa (pace Auguſtini, &c. dixerim) eſſe videtur, ut* Quantacunq; Vis *potius Pauli verbis ſit adhibenda, quam ea admittenda.* That is, *The contrary Opinion (with Auguſtin's leave, and others of his mind) ſeems to me ſo abſurd and pernicious, that we muſt rather put a* Force, *how great ſoever, upon Paul's words, than admit it.*

And, as to the ſuſpicion I had of ſome of their Sentiments, as to *Spiritual Subſiſtences*, (that it may not appear to be groundleſs) He doth (in his *Epiſt.* 5. *ad Volkelium*) abſolutely *deny*, that *the Soul after death doth ſubſiſt*; and adds expreſly, *Oſtendi me ſentire ---- non ita vivere poſt hominis ipſius mortem, ut per ſe præmiorum pœnarumve capax ſit*: that is, that *the Soul after death doth not ſubſiſt; nor is in a capacity of being, by it ſelf, rewarded or puniſhed.* And how he can then think it an *Intelligent Being*, I do not ſee. St. *Paul*, it ſeems,

was

was of another mind, when *he had a deſire to be diſſolved* (or *depart hence*) *and to be with Chriſt*, as being *far better* for him, than to *abide in the fleſh*, Phil. 1. 23, 24. *And willing rather to be abſent from the body, and preſent with the Lord*, 2 Cor. 5. 8. Now I do not underſtand the advantage of his *being with Chriſt*, or being *preſent with the Lord*; if he were then to be in a *ſenſleſs condition*, not capable of pain or pleaſure, puniſhment or reward.

In *Epiſt.* 3. *ad Dudithium*, we have theſe words, *Unuſquiſq; ſacræ Scripturæ ex ſuo ipſius ſenſu Interpres: eaq; quæ ſibi ſic* Arrident *pro veris admittere debet ac tenere, licet univerſus terrarum Orbis in alia omnia iret.* That is, *Every one is to interpret Scripture according to his own ſence: and what ſo* ſeems Pleaſing *to him, he is to imbrace and maintain, though all the World be againſt it.*

Socinus, in his Tract, *de Eccleſia*, pag. 344. ſays thus, *Non attendendum quid homines doceant ſentiantve, vel antehac docuerint aut ſenſerint, quicunq; illi tandem, aut quotcunque, ſint aut fuerint.* Which is pretty plain. *I am not* (ſays he) *to regard what other men do teach or think, or have before now taught or thought; whoſoever, or how many ſoever, they be or have been.* And if his *whoſoever* are not here to be extended to the Sacred Writers; he tells us

of

of them elſewhere, *Ego quidem, etiamſi non ſemel, ſed ſæpe, id in* ſacris monimentis *ſcriptum extaret, non idcirco tamen ita rem prorſus ſe habere crederem.* Soc. de Jeſu Chriſto ſervatore, Par. 3. cap. 6. Operum Tom. 2. p. 204. *As for me* (ſaith he) *though it were to be found written in the* Sacred Moniments, *not once, but many times, I would not yet for all that believe it ſo to be.* And a little before, in the ſame Chapter, (having before told us, that he thought the thing *Impoſſible*,) he adds, *Cum ea quæ fieri non poſſe aperte conſtat, divinis etiam oraculis ea facta fuiſſe in ſpeciem diſerte atteſtantibus, nequaquam admittantur; & idcirco ſacra verba, in alium ſenſum quam ipſa ſonant, per inuſitatos etiam tropos quandoq; explicantur.* That is, *When it doth plainly appear*, (or when he thinks ſo, whatever all the World think beſide) *that the thing cannot be; then, though the Divine Oracles do ſeem expreſly to atteſt it, it muſt not be admitted: and therefore the Sacred Words are, even by unuſual Tropes, to be interpreted to another ſence than what they ſpeak.* Which Sayings are, I think, full as much as I had charged him with.

And if theſe Inſtances be not enough, I could give him more of like nature. But I ſhall conclude this with one of a later date: at a *Publick Diſputation* at *Franeker*, Octob. 8. 1686. where (a-

mongſt others) this *Theſis* was maintained; *Scripturæ divinitatem non aliunde quam ex Ratione adſtrui poſſe; Eoſq; Errare, qui aſſerere ſuſtinent, Si Ratio aliud quid nobis dictaret quam Scriptura, huic potius eſſe credendum.* And when *Ulricus Huberus* (becauſe it was not publickly cenſured, as he thought it deſerved to be) did oppoſe it in Word and Writing; the ſame was further aſſerted, in Publick Diſputations, and in Print, by two other Profeſſors in *Franeker*, in Vindication of that former Theſis; that, *If Reaſon do dictate to us any thing otherwiſe than the Scripture doth; It is an Error to ſay, that, in ſuch caſe, we are rather to believe the Scripture.* An account of the whole is to be ſeen at large in a Treatiſe entituled, *Ulrici Huberi, Supremæ Friſiorum Curiæ ex-ſenatoris, De concurſu Rationis & Scripturæ Liber. Franakeræ apud Hen. Amama & Zachar. Tædama, 1687.* And a Breviate of it in the *Lipſick Tranſactions* for the Month of *Auguſt*, 1687. And, after this, I hope this Anſwerer will not think me too ſevere in charging ſuch Notions on ſome of the *Socinians*, while yet (I ſaid) *I was ſo charitable as to think divers of them were better minded.*

But what ſhould make him ſo angry at what I ſaid of *Gueſſing*, I cannot imagine. That *there is a Diſtinction between the Three, we are ſure*; (this

I had

I had ſaid before, and the Anſwerer now ſays, It is ſo.) *But not ſuch as to make three Gods*; (this I had ſaid alſo, and the Anſwerer ſays ſo too.) That *the Father is ſaid to Beget, the Son to be Begotten, and the Holy Ghoſt to Proceed*, I had ſaid alſo, (and I ſuppoſe he will not deny,) becauſe thus *the Scripture tells us.* (And whatever elſe the Scripture tells us concerning it, I readily accept.) But if it be further asked, (beyond what the Scripture teacheth,) as, for inſtance, *What this Begetting is*, or, *How the Father doth Beget his only begotten Son*; This, I ſay, *we do not know*, (at leaſt I do not) becauſe this, I think, the Scripture doth not tell us; (and of this therefore I hope this Gentleman *will give me leave to be ignorant*:) Certainly it *is not* ſo as when one Man begets another; but How *it is*, I cannot tell. And if I ſhould ſet my thoughts awork, (as ſome others have done, and each according to his own imagination) to *Gueſs* or Conjecture, *How perhaps it may be*; I would not be *Poſitive*, That *juſt ſo it is*: Becauſe I can *but Gueſs* or Conjecture, I cannot be *ſure* of it. (For I think it is much the ſame as if a man born Blind, and who had never ſeen, ſhould employ his Fancy to think, What kind of thing is Light or Colour: of which it would be hard for him to have a clear and certain

Idea.) And if this Gentleman pleaſe to look over it again, I ſuppoſe he will ſee, that he had no cauſe to be ſo angry, that I ſaid, We *can but Gueſs* herein, at what *the Scripture doth not teach us.*

That the *Socinians* have ſet their Wits awork to find out other Subſidiary Arguments and Evaſions againſt the Trinity, beſide that of its Inconſiſtence with Reaſon, I do not deny: But That is the Foundation, and the reſt are but Props. And if they admit, that there is in it no Inconſiſtence with Reaſon; they would eaſily anſwer all the other Arguments themſelves.

I thought not to meddle with any of the Texts on either ſide, becauſe it is beſide the Scope which I propoſed, when I confined my Diſcourſe to that ſingle Point, of its not being Impoſſible or Inconſiſtent with Reaſon: and did therefore ſet aſide other Conſiderations, as having been ſufficiently argued by others, for more than an Hundred Years laſt paſt. But having already followed him in ſome of his Excurſions, I ſhall briefly conſider the two ſignal places which he ſingles out as ſo mainly *clear.*

In the former of them, *John* 17. 3. *This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God,*

God, and Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent; he puts a Fallacy upon us: which perhaps he did not ſee himſelf, or at leaſt hoped we would not ſee it. And therefore I deſire him to conſider, that it is not ſaid *Thee only* to be the true God; but Thee, the *only true God*. And ſo in the Greek; it is not σὲ μόνον ϯ, but σὲ ϯ μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεόν. The Reſtrictive μόνον, *only*, is not annexed to *Thee*, but to *God*. To know *Thee* to be the *only true God*; that is, to be that God, beſide which God, there is no other true God. And We ſay the like alſo, That the Father is that God, beſide which there is no other true God: and ſay, the Son is alſo (not another God, but) the ſame only true God. And if thoſe words, ἵνα γινώσχωσί σε ϯ μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεὸν, χ᾽ ὃν ἀπέστειλας Ἰησοῦν χριστόν; ſhould be thus expounded, *To know Thee to be the only true God; and whom thou haſt ſent, Jeſus Chriſt*, (to be the ſame only true God;) repeating ἀπὸ κοινοῦ, thoſe words ϯ μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεόν· he would not like that interpretation; but both the Words and the Sence will very well bear it, (without ſuch Force as they are fain to put upon many other places.) Or if, without ſuch repetition, we take this to be the ſcope of the place; To ſet forth the two great Points of the Chriſtian Religion, or Way to Eternal Life; That *there*

is but one true God (though in that Godhead there be three Persons, as elsewhere appears,) in opposition to the *many Gods* of the Heathen: and the Doctrine of Redemption, by *Jesus Christ*, *whom God hath sent*, (of which the Heathen were not aware:) the sence is very plain. And nothing in it so clear, as he would have us think, against the Trinity; but all very consistent with it.

And the same Answer serves to his other place, 1 *Cor.* 8. 6. *But to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him,* (or *for him*:) *and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.* For here also *One God* may be referred διὰ κοινῶ, both to *the Father* (if here taken as a distinct person) and to *the Lord Jesus Christ*: Or, without that, it is manifest, that *One God* is here put in opposition (not to the plurality of Persons, as we call them, in One Deity; but) to the *many Gods* amongst the Heathen: and our *one Saviour*, against their *many Saviours*. As is manifest, if we take the whole context together; *We know that an Idol is nothing in the World: and that there is no other God but one. For though there be that are called Gods, whether in Heaven or in Earth, (as there be Gods many, and Lords many:) But to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things,*

and

and we in him; and one Lord Jeſus Chriſt, by whom are all things, and we by him, Ver. 4, 5, 6. Where it is evident, that the ſcope of the place is, not to ſhew either how the Perſons (as we call them) or how the Attributes of that One God are diſtinguiſhed amongſt themſelves: But to ſet our *One God* (who is the Father or Maker of all things,) in oppoſition to the *Many Gods* of the Idolatrous World: and our *One Saviour* or Redeemer, againſt their *Many Saviours*. Indeed, if we ſhould ſet up our Jeſus Chriſt to be *another God*, the Text would be againſt us; but not when we own him for *the ſame* God. So that here is nothing clear in either place (as he pretends) againſt Chriſt's being the *ſame God* with the Father.

But in that other place of *John* 1. (which he labours to elude) the evidence for it doth ſo ſtare him in the face, that if he were not (as he ſpeaks) *Wilfully blind*, (or did Wink very hard) he muſt needs ſee it. *In the beginning was the Word; and the Word was with God; and the Word was God. The ſame was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made. In him was life, and the life was the light of men,* (Ver. 1, 2, 3, 4.) *He was in the World; and the World was made by him; and*

the

the World knew him not. He came unto his own, and his own received him not. But to as many as received him, he gave power (or *right*, or *privilege*,) *to become the ſons of God, even to them that believe on his Name*, (Ver. 10, 11, 12.) *And the Word was made fleſh, and dwelt among us; and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father; full of grace and truth*, (Ver. 14.) Why he ſhould not think this very clear, is very ſtrange, if he were not ſtrangely prepoſſeſſed. Unleſs he think nothing clear, but ſuch as no man can cavil againſt. But there can hardly be any thing ſaid ſo clearly, but that ſome or other (if they liſt to be contentious) may cavil at it, or put a *forced ſence* upon it. For thus the whole Doctrine of Chriſt, when himſelf ſpake it, (and he ſpake as clearly, as he thought fit to ſpeak,) was cavilled at. And himſelf tells us the reaſon of it, *Matth.* 13. 14, 15. and *Joh.* 12. 37, 38, 39, 40. and after him St. *Paul*, Acts 28. 26. and *Rom.* 11. 8. Not for want of *clear Light*, but becauſe they *ſhut their eyes*. In *John* 12. it is thus, *But though he had done ſo many miracles before them, yet they believed not on him: That the ſaying of Eſaias the Prophet might be fulfilled, which he ſpake; Lord, who hath believed our report? and to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed? Therefore they could not believe*,

lieve, becauſe Eſaias ſaid again, He hath blinded their eyes and hardened their heart, that they ſhould not ſee with their eyes, nor underſtand with their heart, and be converted, and I ſhould heal them. Theſe things ſaid Eſaias, when he ſaw his glory and ſpake of him. And thus in *Matth* 13. *Hearing ye ſhall hear and ſhall not underſtand, and ſeeing ye ſhall ſee and ſhall not perceive. For this peoples heart is waxed groſs, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have cloſed; leſt at any time they ſhould ſee with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and underſtand with their heart, and ſhould be converted, and I ſhould heal them.* So that 'tis no argument of a place or doctrine's not being clear, becauſe prejudiced perſons are able to pick cavils at it, or put a forced ſence upon it.

But let us ſee what theſe cavils are. *This I confeſs* (ſaith he) *were to the purpoſe, if by the term* Word *could be meant* (he ſhould rather have ſaid, *be meant*) *nothing elſe but a pre-exiſting perſon; and, by the term* God, *nothing but God Almighty the Creator of Heaven and Earth; and if taking thoſe terms in thoſe ſences did not make St.* John *write Nonſence.*

Now in reply to this, I firſt take exception to that phraſe, *if it could be meant of nothing elſe.* For if his meaning be this, *If no Caviller can ſtart*

up another fence, right or wrong : this is no fair play. For hardly can any thing be ſo plain, but that ſomebody may find a pretence to cavil at it. It is enough for us therefore, if *it be thus meant*, without ſaying, it is impoſſible to put a forced ſence upon it. But this would have ſpoiled his deſign, in muſtering up a great many forced ſences; not that he thinks them to be true, (for ſurely they be not all true; and I think none of them are) nor telling us which he will ſtick to; but only that he may caſt a miſt; and then tell us (which is all that he concludes upon it) *the place is abſcure*, he knows not what to make of it.

But when the Miſt is blown off, and we look upon the Words themſelves, they ſeem plain enough, as to all the Points he mentions. *The Word* which *was with God*, and *was God*, and *by whom the World was made*, and which *was made fleſh and dwelt amongſt us, and we ſaw his glory*, and of whom *John bare witneſs*; muſt needs be a *Perſon*; and can be no other than our *Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, who was born of the Virgin *Mary*. And *this Word*, which *was in the beginning*, and by whom *the World was made*, muſt needs have been *pre-exiſtent* before he was ſo born. And *this Word*, which was *with God* (the true God) and *was God*, and by whom *the World was made*, and who

is

is *one with the Father*, (Joh. 10. 30.) and * *who is over all, God bleſſed for ever*, (Rom. 9. 5.) is no other God than *God Almighty, Creator of Heaven and Earth.*) And this plain ſence the words bear, without any force put upon them: Without any Incoherence, Inconſiſtence, or Contradiction; ſave that they do not agree with the *Socinian* Doctrine. And there is no other way to avoid it, but what *Socinus* adviſeth in another caſe, *Quantacunque Vis verbis adhibenda*; *putting a Force upon the words, no matter how great*, to make

* What we render *who is*, (in *Rom.* 9. 5.) is in the Greek, not ὅς ἐστι, but ὁ ὤν, *(he that Is,)* which in *Rev.* 1. 4. (ἀπὸ ὁ ὢν, &c.) and elſewhere, is uſed as a peculiar Name or Title proper to God Almighty; and anſwers to *I AM*, Exod. 3. 14. *I AM hath ſent me unto you* (Of the ſame import with *Jah* and *Jehovah.)* And what is ſaid of God indefinitely, (without reſpect to this or that Perſon in the Godhead) at *Rev.* 1, 4. (for Chriſt in particular is contradiſtinguiſhed, *Ver.* 5.) ἀπὸ ὁ ὢν, καὶ ὁ ἦν, καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, *(from him that Is, and was, and is to come,)* is at *Ver.* 8. applied in particular to Chriſt, *I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, ſaith the Lord, which IS, and was, and is to come, the Almighty.* Which cloſeth the deſcription of Chriſt, that begins at *Ver.* 5. And that, by *the Lord*, is here meant Chriſt, is evident from the whole context, *Ver.* 11, 13, 17, 18, and the whole Second and Third Chapters. And ſo the deſcription of *Chriſt*, Rom. 9. 5. ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, Ἀμήν, in its full Emphaſis, is thus, *that BEING over all*, (or, the Supreme Being) *God bleſſed for ever*, (or the ever bleſſed God) *Amen.* And there will be need of *Socinus*'s Expedient, *(quantacunque Vis Pauli verbis adhibenda)* to make it ſignifie any other God, than *God Almighty, the Creator of Heaven and Earth.*

them, not to ſignifie, what they plainly do. Or elſe to ſay, (which is his laſt refuge) that *St. John writes Nonſence.*

But let him then conſider, Whether this do ſavour of that reſpect which he would have us think they have for the Holy Scripture; and whether we have not reaſon to ſuſpect the contrary of ſome of them. And, Whether we have not reaſon to complain of their putting a *forced ſence* upon plain words, to make them comply with their Doctrine. And laſtly, Whether it be not manifeſt, that the true Bottom of their averſion from the Trinity (whatever other ſubſidiary Reaſons they may alledge) is, becauſe they think it *Nonſence*, or not agreeable with their Reaſon. (For, ſet this aſide, and all the reſt is plain enough; but, becauſe of this, they ſcruple not to put *the greateſt force* upon Scripture.) Nor is there any other pretence of Nonſence in the whole Diſcourſe, ſave that he thinks the Doctrine of the Trinity to be Nonſence. So that the whole Controverſie with him, turns upon this ſingle Point, Whether there be ſuch *Impoſſibility* or *Inconſiſtence*, as is pretended.

That of 1 *John* 5. 7. *There be three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghoſt;*

Ghoſt ; and theſe Three are One : is wanting, he ſays, in ſome Copies. And it is ſo; (and ſo are ſome whole Epiſtles wanting in ſome Copies.) But we will not for that quit the place. For we have great reaſon to think it genuine. If this difference of Copies happened at firſt by chance (upon an overſight in the Tranſcriber) in ſome one Copy, (and thereupon in all that were tranſcribed from thence;) it is much more likely for a Tranſcriber to leave out a line or two which is in his Copy, than to put in a line or two which is not. And if it were upon deſign, it is much more likely that the *Arians* ſhould purpoſely leave it out, (in ſome of their Copies) than the Orthodox foiſt it in. Nor was there need of ſuch falſification; ſince ἓν ἐσμεν, concludes as ſtrongly, as to a Plurality of perſons, (and of the Son in particular; which was the chief controverſie with the *Arians*;) as ἓν εἰσι doth as to all the Three. And, I think, it is cited by *Cyprian*, in his Book *De unitate Eccleſiæ*, before the *Arian* Controverſie was on foot. And therefore, if it were done deſignedly (and not by chance) it ſeems rather to be *razed out by the* Arians, than *thruſt in by the Orthodox*. And the Language of this in the Epiſtle, ſuits ſo well with that of the ſame Author in his Goſpel, that it is a ſtrong pre-

preſumption, that they are both from the ſame Pen. The *Word*, in 1 *John* 5. 7. agrees ſo well with *the Word* in *John* 1. (and is peculiar to St. *John*:) and ἓν εἰσι, in 1 *John* 5. 7. with ἓν ἐσμεν in *John* 10. 30. (*theſe three are One*, with *I and the Father are One*) that I do not at all doubt its being genuine. And that Evaſion of his, *theſe three are one*, that is, *one in teſtimony*, will have no pretence in the other place, where there is no diſcourſe of Teſtimony at all: but *I and the Father are One*, (*unum ſumus*) muſt be *One Thing*, One in *Being*, One in *Eſſence*. For ſo Adjectives in the Neuter Gender, put without a Subſtantive, do uſually ſignifie both in Greek and Latin: and there muſt be ſome manifeſt reaſon to the contrary, that ſhould induce us to put another ſence upon them.

The other place, *Matth.* 28. 19. *Baptizing them in* (or *into*) *the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt*; is not ſo ſlight an evidence as he would make it. For whether εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, (not εἰς τὰ ὀνόματα) be rendred *in the Name*, and taken to denote the joint Authority of Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, admitting the perſon baptized into the Chriſtian Church: Or, *into the Name*, (which this Anſwerer ſeems to like better) and taken to denote the Dedication

of

of the perſon baptized to the joint Service or Worſhip of Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt; (Baptiſm it ſelf being alſo a part of Divine Worſhip:) They are all conjoined; either, as in joint Authority; or as joint Objects of the ſame Religious Worſhip; and, for ought appears, in the ſame Degree. And *Socinus* himſelf doth allow, the Son to be Worſhipped with Religious Worſhip; as *Adoration*, and *Invocation*; as Lawful at leaſt, if not Neceſſary. Now when this Anſwerer tells us of the Firſt Commandment, *Thou ſhalt have no other God but me*, (the God of *Iſrael*;) He might as well have remembred that of Chriſt, *Matth.* 4. 10. *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.* And therefore ſince *Socinus* (and other of his followers) do allow Chriſt to be Worſhipped, they muſt allow him to be God, even the God of *Iſrael.* And I am miſtaken if he be not expreſly called, *the Lord God of Iſrael.* Luke 1. 16. *Many of the children of Iſrael ſhall he* (John the Baptiſt) *turn to the Lord their God; for he ſhall go before Him in the ſpirit and power of Elias*, &c. Now he before whom *John the Baptiſt* was to go in the ſpirit and power of *Elias*, is agreed to be our Lord Jeſus Chriſt; 'tis therefore He that is here called the Lord God of *Iſrael.* And we who own him

ſo

ſo to be, Worſhip no other God in Worſhipping him. It is thoſe, who do not own him ſo to be, and do yet Worſhip him, that are to be charged with Worſhipping another God. Now when here we find Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, all joined in the ſame Worſhip, we have reaſon to take them all for the ſame God; and, that *theſe Three are One.* And do ſay, (as willingly as he) *Hear, O Iſrael, the Lord thy God is One God.* Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, are but One God: As God the Creator, God the Redeemer, and God the Sanctifier, are One God. And what in the Old Teſtament are ſaid of God, indefinitely, without taking notice of this or that of the three Perſons; are, in the New Teſtament, attributed ſome to one, ſome to another, of the three Perſons.

That which makes theſe Expreſſions ſeem harſh to ſome of theſe men, is becauſe they have uſed themſelves to fanſie that notion only of the word *Perſon*, according to which Three Men are accounted to be Three Perſons, and theſe Three Perſons to be Three Men. But he may conſider, that there is another notion of the word Perſon, and in common uſe too, wherein the ſame Man may be ſaid to ſuſtain divers Perſons, and thoſe Perſons to be the ſame Man, That is the

ſame

ſame Man as ſuſtaining divers Capacities. As was ſaid but now of *Tully*, *Tres Perſonas Unus ſuſtineo*. And then it will ſeem no more harſh to ſay, The three Perſons, Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt are one God; than to ſay, God the Creator, God the Redeemer, and God the Sanctifier are one God; which, I ſuppoſe, even to this Anſwerer would not ſeem harſh, or be thought *Nonſence*. It is much the ſame thing, whether of the two Forms we uſe. And, all the Cavils he uſeth, may be equally applied to either. What anſwer therefore he would give to one who ſhould thus object againſt the latter form, will ſerve us as well to what he objects againſt the former.

If therefore the Gentleman pleaſe to conſider it calmly; he will find, that, even amongſt men, though *another perſon* do many times denote *another man*, (and thereupon the words are ſometimes uſed promiſcuouſly,) yet not always; nor doth the word *Perſon* neceſſarily imply it. A *King* and a *Husband* (though they imply very different Notions, different Capacities, different Relations, or different Perſonalities,) yet may both concur in the ſame Man. (Or, in that ſence wherein Perſon is put for Man, in the ſame Perſon.) So a King and a Father, a King and a

Brother, and the like. And this Gentleman, though (in the Dialogue) he ſuſtain two *Perſons*; that of an Opponent, and that of an Anſwerer; or that of a Friend, and that of an Adverſary; (that ſo, while one gives ill Language, the other may give up the Cauſe;) yet they do not act each their own part ſo covertly, but that ſometime the vizard falls off, and diſcovers the *Man* to be the ſame. For though my Letter be *anſwered by a Friend*, pag. 1. yet 'tis the *Neighbour* that is *weary of Writing*, p. 13.

Now, if *Perſon*, in a Proper ſence, when applied to Men, do not imply, that *different Perſons* muſt needs be ſo many *different Men*: much leſs ſhould it be thought *Nonſence*, when (in a Metaphorical ſence) it is applied to God, that *different Perſons* in the Deity, ſhould not imply *ſo many Gods*: Or, that *three Somewhat's* (which we call *Perſons*) may be *One God*. Which is what I undertook to prove.

And, having made this good, I need not trouble my ſelf to name more Texts (though many more there be which give concurrent evidence to this truth) or diſcourſe the whole Controverſie at large, (which was not the deſign of my Letter.) For himſelf hath reduced it to this ſingle Point; When St. *John* ſays, *The Word was*

with

with God, and the Word was God; if by *the Word*, be meant *Chriſt*, and by *God*, the *true God*; Whether, in ſo ſaying, St. *John* do not *ſpeak Nonſence*? And if I evince this *not to be Nonſence*, (as I think I have done) he grants *the place is to the purpoſe*. Which quite deſtroys the Foundation of the *Socinian* Doctrine. Without being obliged to prove, that theſe Perſons are juſt ſuch Perſons, and ſo diſtinct, as what we ſometime call Perſons amongſt Men, (but with ſuch Diſtinction only as is agreeable to the Divine Nature, and not ſuch as to make them Three Gods.) Like as when God the Father is ſaid to *Beget* the Son; not ſo as one man Begets another, (nor is the *Son* ſo a Son as what we call Son amongſt Men:) but ſo as ſuits with the Divine Nature: which *How it is*, we do not perfectly comprehend.

I have now done with him. But I have one thing to note upon what I have before ſaid, of the *Athanaſian Creed*. I there read it, σῶαι οἱ τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις, καὶ συναΐδιαί εἰσι, καὶ ἴσαι· becauſe I ſo find it in the Copy I uſed; which is that at the end of the Greek Teſtament in *Octavo*, Printed at *London* by *John Bill*, 1622; with *Robert Stephan*'s, *Joſeph Scaliger*'s and *Iſaac Caſaubon*'s Annotations. But in *Whitaker*'s Greek Teſtament, reprinted by this

this Copy, 1633, I ſince find it is αἱ τρεῖς. (Which Edition, I ſuppoſe, is followed by ſome others.) I take the former to be the better reading, (as giving a clearer ſence;) and that the Correcter of the Preſs, had put αἱ for οἱ, intending thereby to mend the Greek Syntax, (becauſe ἀποστόλοις follows,) but doth (I think) impair the ſence. But, as to the Doctrine, it is much one whether we read αἱ or οἱ. And what I have ſaid of that whole Creed, is chiefly intended for thoſe who do believe the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, and of Chriſt's *Incarnation*; that there is no reaſon (in my opinion) why they ſhould not allow of that Creed. But ſuch as do not believe thoſe Points, cannot (I grant) approve the Creed. And it is theſe, I ſuppoſe, who would fain have others to diſlike it alſo.

F I N I S.